UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,797	11/03/2003	Glen Van Datta	450133-04881	6263

20999   7590   04/17/2007
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER
MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/700,797	DATTA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-17,20,21,24 and 26-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-17,20,21,24 and 26-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an amendment filed on January 29, 2007 for the

application of Datta et al., for a "Violations in a peer-to-peer relay network" filed

November 3, 2003.

Claims 1, 4-17, 20-21, 24 and 26-28 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4-17, 20-21, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 USC § 103.

Claims 1, 4-6, 17, 21, 24, and 26-28 have been amended.

Claims 2, 3, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 25 have been cancelled.

Claim Objections

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 2, 'cause'

is to be changed to 'causes'. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
    2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
    3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4-17, 20-21, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,899,628) in view of Baughman et al. (INFOCOM 2001. Twentieth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Proceedings. IEEE, 22-26 April 2001) Entitled "Cheat-proof playout for centralized and distributed online games".

As per claim 1, Leen discloses a method of detecting and recovering from violations (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the outcome of a gaming application 114, and further lines 46-53 disclose revealing cheating*) in a relay network (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*), comprising:

receiving a first message having first content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and 48-51, *event information*) at a receiving peer system from a first sending peer system connected to said peer system in a relay (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*) network (col. 7, lines 22-27, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive **first event information 122***)

detecting a manipulation of data in said received first message (col. 8, *lines 46-53, revealing cheating*), said manipulation of data changing the outcome of processing be the receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the **outcome of a***

gaming application *114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players play a gaming application 114)*

receiving a second message having second content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and 48-51, *event information*) at the receiving peer system (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*) from at least one second sending peer system (col. 7, lines 27-30, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive* **second event information 122***)*

wherein the second content data are expected (col. 8, line 48, *certain predetermined thresholds*) to be substantially the same as the first content data (col. 8, lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information 152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain predetermined thresholds associated with the user*)

wherein detecting the manipulation (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the outcome of a gaming application 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players play a gaming application 114*) includes:

comparing by the receiving peer system the first content and second content data (col. 8, lines 34-38, *wherein Leen discloses* **comparing first and second** *statistics information*) and determining that the message from the first sending peer system is different from at least one of the second messages based on the comparison (col. 8, lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information 152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain predetermined thresholds associated with the user*)

Leen discloses a multi-player gaming system (Fig. 1) with a frame-relay network

(col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*). However Leen fails to explicitly disclose a

peer-to-peer network.

Baughman teaches:

and sending a manipulated data alert message (page 110, col. 2, lines 40-42,

alert players) to other peer systems connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (Fig. 4) the manipulated data alert message identifying the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention to use the method of providing cheat-proof playout for online games of

Baughman et al.'s in combination with the system and method for providing game event

management to a user of Leen et al. to provide a secure network.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been

motivated to make the combination because both inventions disclose a method of

detecting a cheating violation in a multi-player online gaming system (Leen, col. 8, lines

46-53, *revealing cheating*) and (Baughman, page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42) in which

players are able to manipulate data to change the outcome of the game (col. 8, lines 21-

25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals characteristics associated*

with the outcome of a gaming application) and (page 105, col. 2, lines 13-17, *wherein*

Baughman discloses Cheating occurs when a player causes updates to game state that

defy the rules of the game or gains an unfair advantage). Leen discloses a system (Fig.

1, element 10) for executing gaming applications that includes a multi-player system

(Fig. 1) including a frame-relay network (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*). He

also discloses other architectures and components of gaming system (Fig. 1, element

10) may be used (col. 4, lines 21-22). Baughman's peer-to-peer network system (page

105, col. 1, lines 27-29) is an architectural variation of Leen's network system, which

increases scalability and performance (Baughman, page 104, col. 1, lines 34-35).

As per claim 4, Leen discloses a method of detecting and recovering from a

cheating (col. 8, lines 46-53, *revealing cheating*) violation (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein*

Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with

the outcome of a gaming application 114, but also characteristics associated with how

particular players play a gaming application 114) in a relay network (col. 4, lines 31-36,

Frame Relay frames), comprising:

receiving a message having content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and 48-51, *event*

information) at a receiving peer system from a first sending peer system connected to

said peer system in a relay (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*) network (col. 7,

lines 22-27, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive first event*

information 122)

detecting a manipulation of data in the received message (col. 8, *lines 46-53,*

revealing cheating), said manipulation of data changing the outcome of processing be

the receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics*

*information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the **outcome of a***

gaming application *114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players*

play a gaming application 114)

wherein detecting said cheating violation includes:

generating predicted data (col. 8, line 48, *certain predetermined thresholds*)

comparing said message from said sending peer system with said predicted data

(col. 8, lines 34-53, *wherein Leen discloses comparing statistics information and*

measuring any combination of event information 152, statistics information 154, and

profile information 156 against certain predetermined thresholds associated with the

user)

determining that said message from said sending peer system is different from

said predicted data (col. 8, lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any*

combination of event information 152, statistics information 154, and profile information

156 against certain predetermined thresholds associated with the user)

Leen fails to explicitly disclose a peer-to-peer network.

Baughman teaches:

and sending a manipulated data alert message (page 110, col. 2, lines 40-42,

alert players) to other peer systems connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (Fig. 4) the manipulated data alert message identifying the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 5, Leen discloses sending said predicted data (col. 8, lines 25-28,

presenting statistic information to users)

Baughman teaches:

to each other peer system connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 6, Leen discloses a method of detecting and recovering from a

security violation (col. 8, lines 46-53, *revealing cheating*) violation (col. 8, lines 21-25,

wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics

associated with the outcome of a gaming application 114, but also characteristics

associated with how particular players play a gaming application 114) in a relay network

(col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*), comprising:

receiving a message having content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and 48-51, *event*

information) at a receiving peer system from a first sending peer system connected to

said peer system in a peer-to-peer relay (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*)

network (col. 7, lines 22-27, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive*

first event information 122)

detecting a security violation in the received message (col. 8, *lines 46-53,*

revealing cheating), said security violation changing the outcome of processing be the

receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics information*

*154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the **outcome of a gaming***

***application** 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players play a*

gaming application 114)

Leen fails to explicitly disclose a peer-to-peer network.

Baughman teaches:

and sending a manipulated data alert message (page 110, col. 2, lines 40-42,

alert players) to other peer systems connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (Fig. 4) the manipulated data alert message identifying the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 7, Leen discloses detecting said security violation includes detecting

invalid data in said message (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics*

information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the outcome of a

gaming application 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players

*play a gaming application 114. Further lines 46-53 disclose **revealing cheating**).*

As per claim 8, Leen discloses detecting said security violation includes detecting

said message was sent using improper sending procedures (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein*

Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with

the outcome of a gaming application 114, but also characteristics associated with how

*particular players play a gaming application 114. Further lines 46-53 disclose **revealing***

***cheating**).*

As per claim 10, Baughman discloses ignoring further messages Sent by said

sending peer system (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 11, Baughman discloses causing said sending peer system to disconnect from said peer-to-peer relay network (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42, *removal from the current game*).

As per claim 12, Leen discloses sending said manipulated data alert message to a server connected to said peer system (col. 8, lines 25-28, *presenting statistic information to users*).

As per claim 13, Leen discloses the data relayed by peer systems is update data for a network environment (col. 9, lines 44-51).

As per claim 14, Leen discloses the data relayed by peer systems is update data for an online game (col. 9, lines 44-51).

As per claim 15, Baughman discloses at least one peer system is a network-enabled game console (Fig. 4).

As per claim 16, Baughman discloses at least two peer systems are connected through the Internet (Fig. 4).

As per claim 17, Leen discloses a relay network (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*), comprising:

means for receiving a first message having first content data (col. 7, lines 8-13

and 48-51, *event information*) at a receiving peer system from a first sending peer

system connected to said peer system in a relay (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay*

frames) network (col. 7, lines 22-27, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may*

receive first event information 122)

means for detecting a manipulation of data in said received first message (col. 8,

lines 46-53, revealing cheating), said manipulation of data changing the outcome of

processing be the receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses*

statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the outcome

of a gaming application 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular

players play a gaming application 114)

means for receiving a second message having second content data (col. 7, lines

8-13 and 48-51, *event information*) at the receiving peer system (col. 4, lines 31-36,

Frame Relay frames) from at least one second sending peer system (col. 7, lines 27-30,

wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive second event information

122)

wherein the second content data are expected (col. 8, line 48, *certain*

predetermined thresholds) to be substantially the same as the first content data (col. 8,

lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information*

152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain

predetermined thresholds associated with the user)

wherein detecting said manipulation includes:

comparing by the receiving peer system the first content and second content

data (col. 8, lines 34-38, *wherein Leen discloses **comparing first and second** statistics*

information) and determining that the message from the first sending peer system is

different from at least one of the second messages based on the comparison (col. 8,

lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information*

152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain

predetermined thresholds associated with the user)

Leen fails to explicitly disclose a peer-to-peer network.

Baughman teaches:

and sending a manipulated data alert message (page 110, col. 2, lines 40-42,

alert players) to other peer systems connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (Fig. 4) the manipulated data alert message identifying the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 20, Leen discloses sending said manipulated data alert message to

a server connected to said peer system (col. 8, lines 25-28, *presenting statistic*

information to users).

As per claim 21, Leen discloses a computer-readable medium storing a

computer-readable program that when executed on a processor cause the processor to

execute (col. 5, lines 38-42) a method in a peer system of a relay network (col. 4, lines

31-36, *Frame Relay frames*), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a first message having first content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and 48-51,

event information) at a receiving peer system from a first sending peer system

connected to said peer system in a relay (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*)

network (col. 7, lines 22-27, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive*

first event information 122)

detecting a manipulation of data in said received first message (col. 8, *lines 46-*

53, revealing cheating), said manipulation of data changing the outcome of processing

be the receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics*

*information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the **outcome of a***

***gaming application** 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players*

play a gaming application 114)

receiving a second message having second content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and

48-51, *event information*) at the receiving peer system (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay*

frames) from at least one second sending peer system (col. 7, lines 27-30, *wherein*

*Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive **second event information 122***)

wherein the second content data are expected (col. 8, line 48, *certain*

predetermined thresholds) to be substantially the same as the first content data (col. 8,

lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information*

152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain

predetermined thresholds associated with the user)

wherein detecting the manipulation (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses*

statistics information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the outcome of

a gaming application 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players

play a gaming application 114) includes:

comparing by the receiving peer system the first content and second content

data (col. 8, lines 34-38, *wherein Leen discloses **comparing first and second** statistics*

information) and determining that the message from the first sending peer system is

different from at least one of the second messages based on the comparison (col. 8,

lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information*

152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain

predetermined thresholds associated with the user)

Leen fails to explicitly disclose a peer-to-peer network.

Baughman teaches:

and sending a manipulated data alert message (page 110, col. 2, lines 40-42,

alert players) to other peer systems connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (Fig. 4) the manipulated data alert message identifying the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 24, Leen discloses sending said manipulated data alert message to

a server connected to said peer system (col. 8, lines 25-28, *presenting statistic*

information to users).

As per claim 26, Leen discloses a method of detecting and recovering from

violations (col. 8, lines 21-25, wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals

not only characteristics associated with the outcome of a gaming application 114, but

also characteristics associated with how particular players play a gaming application

114. Further lines 46-53 disclose revealing cheating) in a relay network (col. 4, lines 31-

36, Frame Relay frames), comprising:

sending a first message having first content data (col. 7, lines 8-13 and 48-51,

event information) at a receiving peer system from a first sending peer system

connected to said peer system in a relay (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*)

network (col. 7, lines 22-27, *wherein Leen discloses event manager 130 may receive*

first event information 122)

detecting a manipulation of data in said sent first message (col. 8, *lines 46-53,*

revealing cheating), said manipulation of data changing the outcome of processing be

the receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics*

*information 154 reveals not only characteristics associated with the **outcome of a***

***gaming application** 114, but also characteristics associated with how particular players*

play a gaming application 114)

wherein detecting said manipulation includes:

relaying (col. 4, lines 31-36, *Frame Relay frames*) back the sent first message to

the sending peer by the receiving peer system (col. 8, lines 25-28, *presenting statistic*

information to users)

comparing by the sending peer system the first content and second content data

(col. 8, lines 34-38, *wherein Leen discloses **comparing first and second** statistics*

information) and determining that the message from the first sending peer system is

different from at least one of the second messages based on the comparison (col. 8,

lines 46-53, *wherein Leen discloses measuring any combination of event information*

152, statistics information 154, and profile information 156 against certain

predetermined thresholds associated with the user)

Leen fails to explicitly disclose a peer-to-peer network.

Baughman teaches:

and sending a manipulated data alert message (page 110, col. 2, lines 40-42,

alert players) to other peer systems connected to said peer system in said peer-to-peer

relay network (Fig. 4) the manipulated data alert message identifying the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 27-42).

As per claim 27, Baughman discloses ignoring messages from the sending peer

responsible for the manipulation of data (page 110, col. 2, lines 43-45).

As per claim 28, Baughman discloses forcing the sending peer responsible for

the manipulation of data to disconnect from the peer-to-peer relay network (page 110,

col. 2, lines 43-45, *removal from the current game*).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,899,628) in view of Baughman et al. (INFOCOM 2001. Twentieth

Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies.

Proceedings. IEEE, 22-26 April 2001) Entitled "Cheat-proof playout for centralized and

distributed online games" and in further view of Yeager et al. (U.S. PGPUB No.
20030028585).

As per claim 9, Leen in view of Baughman discloses user misbehaviors and
cheating violations (Leen, col. 8, lines 49-53) and (Baughman, page 105, col. 2, lines
13-17). However Leen in view of Baughman fails to explicitly disclose denial of service
attacks.

Yeager teaches: said message was sent as part of denial of service attack (page
24, paragraph [0292], lines 6-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention to use the network trust mechanism of Yeager et al.'s in combination with the
system and method for providing game event management to a user of Leen et al. to
provide a secure network.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been
motivated to make the combination because both inventions disclose user misbehaviors
(Leen, col. 8, lines 49-53) and (Yeager, page 24, paragraph [0292]). Both inventions
also disclose users are able to manipulate data to change the outcome of the game
(col. 8, lines 21-25, *wherein Leen discloses statistics information 154 reveals*
characteristics associated with the outcome of a gaming application) and (Yeager, page
10, paragraph [0115]). Manipulating data to change the outcome is considered cheating
(Leen, col. 8, lines 21-25) and Leen discloses detection of user misbehaviors (col. 8,

lines 49-53). Denial of service attacks are a form of user misbehaviors by data

manipulation (Yeager, page 10, paragraph [0115]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments see pages 10-14, filed January 29, 2007 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made over Leen et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,899,628) in view of Baughman et al. (INFOCOM 2001. Twentieth

Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies.

Proceedings. IEEE, 22-26 April 2001) Entitled "Cheat-proof playout for centralized and

distributed online games" and in further view of Yeager et al. (U.S. PGPUB No.

20030028585). Refer to the corresponding section of the claim analysis for details.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571)

272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).